



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fragments are contained in two MSS of Lydgate's Troy-Book, and form the beginning and the conclusion of that work. They are written in riming iambic couplets of four feet.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

Terentiana. Quaestiones cum specimine Lexici, scripsit Dr. EDMUNDU HAULER. Vindobonae apud Hoelderum, 1882. Pp. 47.

The subject of Latin lexicography has come prominently to the foreground within the last decade, and such is the present activity of scholars in this field that the outlook for the future is very hopeful. The special lexicon of Meiguet to the Orations of Cicero, which has already reached the letter Q, and the Lexicon Taciteum of Gerber and Greef, are models of their kind, and in point of fullness and detail of arrangement leave little to be desired. According to recent announcements of Teubner we shall soon have a Lexicon Lucretianum with full citation of passages by Dr. J. Woltjer of Amsterdam, and Dr. Hauler presents us here with what promises to be a very complete lexicon to Terence. A Plautus lexicon can hardly be begun until all the plays have been critically edited. A pressing desideratum which ought to be supplied in the near future is a special lexicon to the letters of Cicero. The indefatigable Dr. Georges, who has just entered on his seventy-seventh year, deserves the lasting gratitude of scholars for the conscientious way in which he has utilized the special monographs on different authors for the improvement of his dictionary. Not, however, until we have complete special lexica to the authors of different periods, and indices to the Inscriptions, can we expect a Latin dictionary which shall in any way adequately represent the wealth of the Latin language.

The editor of a special lexicon to any author must be something more than a mere index-maker. He must enter into the spirit of his author, know his syntax, and have at least a fair acquaintance with the usage of contemporary and preceding writers. Dr. Hauler has wisely given us some evidence of his fitness for the task which he has undertaken by his judicious treatment of several *quaestiones* connected with the text of Terence.

In Eun. v. 267, where Umpfenbach reads

Set Pdrlenonem ante ostium †Thaidis tristem video,

he proposes *huius* (or *eius*) *stare* for *Thaidis*. He reviews the various emendations hitherto proposed (omitting, however, to mention that of Sievers in Acta Soc. Phil. Lips. Vol. II, p. 79 to read *Thainis* for *Thaidis*), and shows that Bentley was on the right track in proposing to read *opperiri*, which verb, however, does not suit the meaning as well as *stare*. *Thaidis* was a gloss for *huius* which afterwards crept into the text. *Statur* in Parmeno's reply, v. 271, supports *stare*. Dr. Hauler will doubtless not be displeased to learn that Bentley in effect anticipated his proposal. On the margin of Bentley's private copy of his 1726 edition of Terence, now preserved in the British Museum under number 833 K. 13 (see Vol. III of this Journal, p. 61 f.), I find *stare eius*, while *opperiri* is underscored as no longer satisfying Bentley. The order *stare eius* was no doubt adopted by Bentley to give the verse the regular caesura. I must not omit to mention that before the verse he has also written *iam stare*. In confirmation

of his conjecture Dr. Hauler might have added that in the similar verse Hec. 428 :

Sed Pámphilum ípsum vídeo stare ante óstium,

stare is actually omitted by the Bembinus ; also that Eugraphius in Eun. II 2, 37 (268) says " *Integra nobis sunt omnia, si quidem adversarii ante ostium stantes, propterea frigide agunt.*"

In Phormio v. 863 where recent editors read *adprehendit* on the authority of the Calliopian recension, Dr. Hauler makes it probable that *reprehendit*, the reading of the Bembinus (first-hand), is to be retained. It is certainly strongly supported by the alliteration,

Póne reprehendit pállio, resuñnat, respició rogo,

and by Epid. I 1, 1: *Quis properantem me reprehendit pallio?* cf. also Trin. 624, Mil. 60. Curiously enough here too Bentley had written on the margin Epid. I 1, 1, as though contemplating the change to *reprehendit*, although he appears not to have known the reading of the Bembinus. The reading *adprehendit* is doubtless due to the fact that when the Calliopian recension was made, *adprehendere* was the verb commonly used in this connection. So the Vulgate has *apprehendens pallium* (cf. Haut. 509 with the Schol. Bemb. cited by Hauler, and Amph. 1116 where B. has *phendit*, but EF *apprehendit*).

Dr. Hauler is equally cogent in his defence of *percepit*, the reading of the Bembine in Hec. 363. The verse should stand

Pártim quae perspéxi his oculis, pártim percepí áuribus,

and furnishes a good example of alliteration. Dr. Hauler might have noted that in Cas. V 2, 5,

Est operae prettúm auribus percipere,

Geppert's P has *accipere*. Later usage no doubt favored *accipere*. Cicero, Philip. VIII 28, has "non dico animo ferre, verum *auribus accipere* potuistis?" and Servius, in his commentary to Aen. IV 359, explains *his auribus hausi* by *accepi*. In Phormio v. 82 Arruntius Celsus furnishes very good warrant for reading *ardere coepit* instead of *amare*, and this reading Dr. Hauler defends against the authority of the MSS.

He next discusses the form of the voc. of Greek nouns having the nom. in *ēs*, and criticises Umpfenbach and Fleckeisen for uniformly reading *Laches* and *Chremes*, often against the distinct testimony of the MSS and of Priscian, in favor of *Lache*, *Chreme*. As a result of his investigation he finds that both *Chremes* and *Chreme* are used indifferently at the close of a verse, and within the verse before *m* and *t*, while before *a*, *qu*, *i*, *cons*, *Chremes* occurs; before *p*, *s*, *v*, *c* only the form *Chreme*. In my collation of the cod. Dunelmensis (Bentley's 'codex vetustissimus') I find *Chreme* in vv. 550, 574, 868, 895, 906, 930, 945, and *Chremes* in vv. 241, 561, 917, 946. This may help to explain Bentley's preference for *Chreme*. He only admits the form *Chremes* in Eun. 535, 743, and Haut. 1052. Subsequently, however, I find that he admitted it in And. 945 (V 4, 42), where according to his marginal notes he would also read *Pasibulast*. CH. *ípsa ea'st*, with a reference to Ph. V 1, 11. The remainder of Dr. Hauler's dissertation is taken up with a discussion of some peculiar forms of *ὁμοιστέλεντον* in Early Latin, and

an exposition of words borrowed from the Greek found in Terence, with such data as are ascertainable in regard to their introduction into the Latin language. These sections cannot be so readily summarized. The *Prolegomena ad Lexicon Terentianum*, pp. 27-35, set forth the principles which are to govern him in the use of editions, the mention of various readings, the orthography and other matters. The plan is so well conceived, and the few specimen pages of A (closing with the word *acu*) are so thoroughly good, that we can only wish that everything will prove favorable to the speedy execution of his design, so that we may have ere long a *Lexicon Terentianum* worthy of the name.

M. WARREN.

Deutsche Litteraturdenkmale des 18 Jahrh. in Neudrucken herausgeg. von
BERNHARD SEUFFERT. Heilbronn: Gebr. Henninger. 1882.

6. *Hermann* von C. M. Wieland.

It is not very long since Germanistic Philology began to investigate the German language, after the Reformation, with a care similar to that given to the older forms of the language. The poets of the 18th century especially, who represent to us the last stage of the German language, had long been neglected. This may have been due partly to the practice of measuring them merely with reference to their aesthetic and literary value, partly to the fact that they stood too near us to be judged with an historical eye. But this time has now passed. And as it seems that a total reformation in the method of writing the history of literature will soon be necessary, we desire to have those specimens of literature before our eyes, which have so far been very rare.

The new print of Wieland's "*Hermann*" forms the 6th number in the series of this laudable enterprise, conducted by B. Seuffert, which seems to continue Braune's *Neudrucke des 16 u. 17 Jahrh.* The selection of the pieces that have appeared so far shows taste and discrimination, and we are glad to have Wieland's "*Hermann*" now for the first time printed in full from the manuscript of the poet. It belongs to that kind of patriotic poetry which was introduced by Klopstock. The preface to our edition, although written with care, is in the usual dry style of such introductions, and forgets to point out the great patriotic movement among the young poets of the last century, how in the midst of great political misery they dreamed of a German fatherland, and how their aspirations were finally crowned with the events of 1871. To this movement, essentially the opposition of German thought and sentiment to French influence, we owe the best of Herder's and Goethe's youthful productions, and in this historic light alone does Wieland's "*Hermann*" receive its value. The poem shows us the future qualities of Wieland's poetry already "*in nuce*," although he was still a very dependent disciple of Klopstock. This dependence, as well as the difference of Wieland's and Klopstock's style and language, could also have been set forth to better advantage in the introduction.

If we are allowed to make a suggestion we would like to see also Karl Philipp Moritz: *Ueber die bildende Nachahmung des Schönen*, Braunschweig, 1788, in this series.

JULIUS GOEBEL.